

## The Sun.

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1893.

THE SUN to-day consists of twelve pages. Our friends should note that the New York edition is published at the same price as the other editions.

Subscription by Mail—Post Paid.  
DAILY, Per Month..... \$3.00  
DAILY, Per Year..... \$30.00  
SUNDAY, Per Year..... \$5.00  
WEEKLY, Per Year..... \$1.00  
THE SUN, New York City.

The regular circulation of THE SUN for the week ending Sept. 19, 1893, was:  
Sunday..... 133,725  
Monday..... 133,725  
Tuesday..... 133,725  
Wednesday..... 133,725  
Thursday..... 133,725  
Friday..... 133,725  
Saturday..... 133,725  
Total for the week..... 936,075

## Frequent Elections a Good Thing.

Some political theorists who look down upon the common people, are pleased to lament the frequency of elections in the United States. They fear that among so many elections the electors will lose their interest in some, and, besides, the eternal din of politics is disagreeable to their ears. Popular government is too popular for them, and frequent changes almost as undesirable in elective as in non-elective offices. They would like to see longer terms for the former as well as a life term for the latter.

With these gentlemen it is unnecessary to argue, for their difficulty is a profound distrust of people and much personal discomfort in democratic government. But even if frequent elections, National, State, and local, were not necessary under our American system, it would still be desirable to have them. It is sometimes said that life in a new community like the United States must be dull; but how dull it would be, at least to men, without politics, and a good deal of politics! Women seem generally deaf to the charm of politics, but perhaps the women suffrage advocates may yet convert the sex.

To most men who are as yet genuinely and unaffectedly American, politics is not merely a business of momentous importance to the country, but also a source of considerable interest and amusement. And even to be considered seriously as far as voting goes, but before the voting is had, there are vast opportunities of excitement and fun, and the election is a particularly one-sided one or the year an especially "off" year. Moreover, the pleasure is mainly intellectual. The struggle of political parties is a lively and acrimonious debate, and even in local elections, where it sometimes happens that party demarcations are not closely observed, there is still usually some question of local importance, on which public opinion can be influenced by the action of the newspapers and the political meetings, the speeches, the barbecues, the "ordinary American" gets a good deal of pleasure. He wants the truth and means to have it, but the lies that circulate he understands too. He recognizes in them—in part at least—a humorous exaggeration, a tendency to which is a characteristic of the humor of his country.

All the time he is learning something, he sits as a judge to hear opposing arguments, he is picking out the chaff from the wheat, and using and rejecting his stock of common sense and of political knowledge. He has a few hours or only a few minutes a day to politics, but he is thoughtful about it and enjoys it, and the hotter the fight the more he enjoys it. It would be a great loss to him to have elections only at long intervals. The preparations for elections, the time between nominations and elections, stir him up and prevent his becoming sluggish. But however much he may be stirred up by an election, he soon subsides after it is past, hurries a little if he likes, and laughs if he is liked, and then goes on with his ordinary life. Decidedly, frequent elections are a good thing, and bustling campaigns are a good thing. And, by the way, a rather bustling campaign will go on in this State within the next few weeks.

## The Canvass Going on in France.

Less than three weeks now intervene before the general election in France, yet it is no less difficult to forecast the composition of the next Chamber of Deputies than it was at the outset of the political campaign. Undoubtedly the Opportunists, who since 1877 have virtually been the masters of the Government, have lost a great deal of ground, and if the voting were again to take place in conformity with the *scrutin d'arrondissement* system, as we should say, the Congress district system, they would have no reasonable chance for retaining round authority in the next Chamber; but their opponents are not so sure. But all calculations are subject to uncertainty regarding the outcome of the *scrutin de liste*, a mode of voting substantially coincident with the collective ticket whereby in this country the Presidential electors are chosen.

We have had in our political history some striking exhibitions of the complex results of which even this ostensibly simple scheme is capable, the latest example being furnished by New Jersey in 1890, where Mr. LINCOLN, who had been a Presidential elector, although his supporters were a minority of the voters, because some of the Democrats men refused to vote for the BELL and BRECKINRIDGE candidates on the fusion ticket. The cutting of specially obnoxious names from a ticket otherwise acceptable in France, where political animosities are more impleable. It is certain, for instance, that the name of M. FERRY will be erased by many Opportunist voters.

But although some difficulty may be experienced by the party now headed by Premier Bismarck in polling its full vote for all the nominees presented on a department ticket, obstruction will also be encountered by the reactionists in their attempts to carry out the scheme of fusion. The monarchists and the Bonapartists differ widely with regard to the number of places which ought to be apportioned to the latter faction on certain lists, and the result is that the anti-republican coalition has been broken up in certain quarters. Even where a union of Conservatives has been nominally effected, it has proved too hard to select a Napoleonic candidate satisfactory to all the voters and to the monarchists. Neither can a nominee conspicuous in the past for advocacy of Opportunist opinions expect to get the whole reactionary vote in the legitimist stronghold.

Nevertheless, the monarchists are so decidedly preponderant in a few departments that they are thought likely, under the *scrutin de liste*, to return a somewhat larger quota of members to the new Chamber than they commanded in the last. Yet the gain at worst would be too inconsiderable to alarm the friends of M. BISMARCK, but for the certainty that the united Radicals and Socialists, under the guidance of M. CLEMENCEAU, will make formidable roads on the Opportunist stronghold in Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles, for example, the followers of CLEMENCEAU look forward to controlling every seat. If their anticipations are fulfilled, the present Ministry will fall to secure a majority of the Chamber over Radicals and reactionists combined, and the prospect of this state of things has caused the mooting of a desperate expedient in some Opportunist newspapers. Just as in London the old-fashioned Whig and Tory organs have advised that the votes of Parliament members of Parliament shall not be counted on any Cabinet question, so it has been proposed in Paris that the votes of reactionists shall not figure in the creation or overthrow of republican Ministries.

There is a much better pretext in France than in England for such a practical disfranchisement of the voters represented by the eliminated members. Mr. PARNELL does not aim at the ruin of the present British polity, and, in the absence of a fair test of the home project, no one has a right to suppose that the French monarchists will adopt in 1893 would have such subversive results. But the French monarchists avow an unapassable hostility to republican forms of government. What they really care about is not a mutation of Ministries, but a fundamental change of polity. It might, therefore, be plausibly maintained that a refusal to permit the cause of reaction to profit by their private quarrels is the duty of Radicals and Opportunists alike, all Frenchmen, in a word, who are loyal to the republic. Nothing is more certain, notwithstanding, that the rejection of such a device by the Radicals, and even those who favor such a ploy would in practice seek excuses for breaking it. Besides, an attempt to disfranchise the monarchists would cause in the end a national riot in favor of the men who, whatever their preferences as to forms of government, abundantly demonstrated in the last war with Germany their right to be esteemed as patriots.

## Too Much Modesty.

Slowly and majestically the DREXEL boom spreads itself across the broad pages of our esteemed contemporary, the *Albany Evening Journal*. The present line of progress of the boom may be roughly described as about north-north-west—that is to say, from the region of obscure political items and clippings in the southeastern part of our highly esteemed contemporary's editorial territory toward the boundless and double-loaded ocean of the leading article.

Since the disinterested efforts of THE SUN secured the insertion of Brother DREXEL's name in the New York City Directory, so that no voter can longer doubt that he is in fact a resident of New York, not of Philadelphia, the *Albany Evening Journal* has taken it upon itself to announce that it has day after day that an experienced business man, an Episcopalian, a gentleman noted for philanthropy, integrity, and correct habits, is the candidate demanded in the present emergency. When the *Evening Journal* gets one step further, and adds to its list of requisite qualifications for the Republican candidate for Governor in 1893 the ability to interpret on the bassoon with power and sympathy the music of the great masters of melody, we presume that the identification will be complete.

But why should our esteemed contemporary engineer the DREXEL boom with such extreme deliberation and caution? Is it because of the intimate personal and financial relations which are reported to exist between Mr. JOSEPH W. DREXEL and the *Journal* establishment? Those relations, far from restraining the *Albany newspaper*, ought to embolden it to proclaim with authority the good qualities of its amiable friend. Too much modesty has spoiled many an otherwise promising boom; and if Mr. DREXEL's canvass lacks the promptness and vitality that service we are amply rewarded by the consciousness of duty done. At any time we shall be happy to say a good word in behalf of one of the most amiable, comfortable, and musical residents of lower Madison avenue; but in the great pressure of diverse and complex interests requiring attention at this time, we cannot undertake to do more than this. The *Journal*, we say, must put its own shoulder to the wheel.

She Laments Her Lack of Beauty.

A young woman who begs us to publish her letter, lost her identity by discovery, gives us a sketch of her life from childhood, and then lays bare the sorrow which now secretly oppresses her. Her case, in brief, is that of a woman who bitterly laments the lack of physical beauty, and cries out in pain because her sensitive feminine spirit is confined in a frame of almost masculine ruggedness.

It seems that from early childhood she has been compelled to do hard and rough work, because of the circumstances of her family, and that now as a woman she bears physical traces of the severity of the struggle, which cause her "great grief and mortification." She has grown tall, with a "large, bony frame," stoops considerably because of her height and the weakening effect of her unremitting toil; has "a coarse appearance," that betrays the refinement and delicacy of her nature. So hampered physically, she has become shy and retiring, and is distressed beyond measure by her inability to give expression to her "tender impulses and yearnings," and by the thought that those about her can never understand her as she really is. Having thus described her case, this unhappy young woman calls on us for advice:

"I have tried to improve myself, and earnestly asked you to help me; but my trouble is what I seem to have no power to control. I have tried to make my own bones—erect or grow less? Do the bones of our limbs ever grow stouter naturally without being affected by disease? I have read articles of food that I could abstain from that would cause my frame to become smaller? Do not think me foolish in asking these questions; for only my Heavenly Father knows how I have struggled to bear my burdens and sorrows, and how hard I have tried to overcome the difficulty and feelings which grieve me so. I was a hard laborer, constantly helping and assisting others, and I have been a great deal of help to many. I am still laboring to be helpful and kind to others, but hope there is a possibility of my frame becoming smaller, more refined, which would enable me to feel and appear as I wish to be."

She is wrong in supposing that she owes

her large bones and great height to the severity of the work she has done. However she has been brought up, and no matter how luxurious her surroundings, her frame would have been about the same as it is now, for that is an inheritance from which she could not escape. Hard toil and exposure have undoubtedly marred the grace of her figure and given her a muscular development which seems coarse, but they have not changed the general character of her framework, though they may have bent and twisted it. As she got it by inheritance so it must remain, and no physician and no regimen can alter it.

But as she grows older, and eats the better and more nutritious food her present circumstances allow her to obtain, nature is likely to do the work of softening the apparent outlines without aid from art. If she is healthy, the accumulating flesh may gradually conceal the ruggedness of the frame which now so greatly grieves her and give evenness to the angularity at present so mortifying to her spirit. Many a raw-boned and awkward girl of fifteen has become a beautiful and stately woman ten years later, and many a woman in whom beauty seemed to be altogether lacking at twenty-five has at forty outstripped in physical attractiveness the belles of her youth who have matured by her side. The strength of her features has better stood the test of time than the softness and delicacy of their contours.

If our correspondent is tall, that is an advantage, and not, as she thinks, a disadvantage. A grand make like hers attempts to hide her superior height by stooping. Carry yourself as erect as you can, and give the whole figure a chance for development. A tall woman who bears herself easily and gracefully is always a commanding figure, and such a woman needs a strong framework, and symmetry requires that her features should be in proportion to her size.

But, first of all, our unhappy correspondent must stop thinking about her frame and her features. She cannot alter them, and she only calls attention to such defects as they have by her self-consciousness. Grace and ease are not possible for her until she gives up anxiety on that subject, and without grace and ease a woman can never be beautiful and charming. Don't trouble yourself about the impression you are making on people, who don't think half as much about you as you suppose, but be as you naturally are. If you make yourself interesting they will forget whether you are physically beautiful or ugly, and if you reveal to them charms of character and disposition you will not fail of their admiration or attachment because your bones are large. It has not been the women of the most perfect beauty of face and figure who have won the most hearts, and the belle of the season is by no means the prettiest girl of the ballrooms.

Have you ever seen a picture of GEORGE ELIOT, or of GEORGE SAND, or of Mme. DE STAEL? They were all raw-boned women, with heavy features, yet they failed neither of love nor of fame. Even MARY, Queen of Scots, was cross-eyed—at least they say so.

## A Christian Communist.

Count Tolstoy, the Russian novelist, has lately published in France a remarkable book in which he describes his conversion to the doctrines of Christianity. In brief, he has at last discovered that the remedy for the ills of society, which modern communism, socialism, and nihilism have in vain searched for, is only to be found in the teachings of the Gospels.

But that remedy, he also discovers, involves the total revolution and transformation of society, whose customs and regulations are directly at variance with the principles laid down by Jesus. The social uprising desired by the wildest of modern Communists would be slight in comparison with that which is necessary to bring the world into obedience to Christianity as Count Tolstoy understands it.

In places of strife and competition we must have love and brotherhood. There can be no resistance to violence, no right to law, and therefore no courts of law; no oaths, and therefore no promises of fidelity to Governments supported by oaths; no accumulation of wealth; no desire for glory and fame and fine garments and delicate food; no ambition of the one to rise above the other, and hence no classes and no distinctions. The whole system of trade, commerce, and finance must be overthrown. There will be no rights of property to defend, and no division into States, for the whole world will be one commonwealth, and men will be brothers laboring for the good of each other.

But does not Christianity teach exactly that, and is not Count Tolstoy right in saying that it cannot be reduced to practice without running counter to all the regulations, usages, customs, and prejudices of the world, and giving up everything society holds as desirable and respectable?

After he "arrived at the true faith," in 1879, he set about to live up to his convictions, and the result is that he is regarded by his old friends and associates as a downright lunatic. He renounced his property and began a life of luxury and honor, and began a new existence as a peasant, making shoes for a living at the intervals of farm work. "In the practice of my doctrine," he says, "I can no longer contribute to anything which shall raise me even in appearance above others, or separate me from them. I can recognize neither in myself nor in others titles, ranks, or qualities beyond the title and quality of 'man.' I can seek no instruction which separates me from the masses." Because of his refusal to take an oath he has been fined, and one of the many follies which he has found in Russia, has been put in prison for refusing to render military service.

But who can deny that Count Tolstoy is a consistent Christian? Is there anything in his principles that was not taught by the divine Founder of Christianity? And can any man be truly called a consistent Christian who does not do as he does?

## Senator Eustis and the President.

There has been so much misrepresentation respecting the attitude of Senator EUSTIS of Louisiana toward the President, that the authentic expression of his views and purpose has become a matter of general interest. We copy accordingly from the last number of the *North American Review* the very moderate and judicious statement which he has put forth.

Like the vast majority of Democrats, Mr. EUSTIS is frankly opposed to the civil service system of which Mr. EATON is the chief representative, and he sets forth the reasons for his opposition with clearness and dignity. As a Democrat he advocated the election of Mr. CLEVELAND, expecting that it would produce a Democratic victory, and he is disappointed. Yet he does not propose any factious opposition to the President. He thinks that Mr. CLEVELAND has been led into a serious error in attempting to commit the Democratic party to a measure for which the party is not prepared, and to which there is no reason to believe that a majority approve of it. He sees that there is a conflict, and he expresses the hope that it may not become embittered so as to

impair "the beneficent ascendancy of the Democracy."

We join most heartily with Mr. EUSTIS in this wish.

## The Renomination of Judge Barrett.

A Justice of the Supreme Court is to be elected this autumn in the First Judicial district, comprising the city and county of New York, to succeed the Hon. GEORGE C. BARRETT, whose present term on the bench expires this year.

He should be his own successor. He has been a Judge, and a good Judge, for many years, having served for a considerable time on the bench of the Court of Common Pleas before his election to the Supreme Court. No one can question his capacity as a lawyer or his integrity as a man. He has proved a faithful public servant, and he has been the highest trust, and the Democratic party, to which he belongs, can hardly fail to recognize this by placing his name again before the people. It is true he is identified with neither of the city factions, but that is in his favor as a Judge, and is an excellent reason why both should nominate him.

Indeed, the Republicans could not do better than to make Judge BARRETT their candidate also. In the Second Judicial district the Republicans seem likely to unite with the Democrats in re-electing Judge JOSEPH F. BARNARD ofoughness, and their example may well be followed in this city in the case of Judge BARRETT.

The malice of the prosecution of THOMAS STREAR, editor of the *London Pall Mall Gazette*, is made clearly apparent by the full report of the first day's proceedings received by yesterday's mail. The offense charged against Mr. STREAR is that he had published nothing more than that of taking the child ELEANOR away from the custody of her parents, of chloroforming her, and of subjecting her to physical examination. It is not pretended by the prosecutors that the girl was injured or ill treated in any way, or that she did not return to her home after the operation, which was done to her was done, it is conceded, without evil intent, and solely for the purpose of showing how easily the ruin of young girls in London might be accomplished, and often is accomplished. Mr. STREAR may possibly be charged with having committed the crime, but the prosecution will involve no disgrace, and will only set upon those who are laboring for it. The ablest counsel are engaged on both sides, and the result will be looked for with interest.

## Conspicuous Men who Died of Heart Disease.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

On Feb. 11, 1892, Dr. Wm. Olinson, then Governor of the State of Oregon, died of heart disease. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870. In the evening he was sitting in his private library with his son, the present Judge W. Olinson, looking over the papers of his father. He had a letter in his hand, when he dropped it on the floor and immediately expired. He died of heart disease, then little known under that name. He had been a member of the Legislature since 1870, and a Senator in Congress, many terms Governor, and a candidate for President. He was a man of majestic mien, and one of the foremost statesmen of the country. His death was a great loss to the State.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

Wise Called to Account—Gen. Lee, who had been called to account for his conduct in the war, was called to account for his conduct in the war.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

He is the Man who Brought Charges Against the War.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.